

SeUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SCOTT SEDORE, #210661,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:16-cv-903
-v-)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
SHERRY BURT, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Scott Sedore filed this civil rights lawsuit claiming that employees of the Michigan Department of Correction (MDOC) and employees of Corizon, Inc. were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs. The Corizon Defendants (Bien, Decker, Howard and Worel) filed a motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 125.) The MDOC Defendants (Burt, Wilkinson, and Hamilton) filed their own motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 139). The magistrate judge issued a report recommending the motions be granted. (ECF No. 156.) Plaintiff filed objections. (ECF No. 157.)

After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). "[A]n objection that does nothing more than state a disagreement with the

magistrate's suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an 'objection' as that term is used in the context of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72." *Brown v. City of Grand Rapids, Michigan*, No. 16-2433, 2017 WL 4712064, at *2 (6th Cir. June 16, 2017).

Sedore's objections are not sufficiently specific for this Court to perform a de novo review. Sedore simply advances a blanket objection to the entire report and recommendation.

Accordingly, the report and recommendation is **ADOPTED** as the Opinion of this Court. The two motions for summary judgment (ECF Nos. 125 and 139) are **GRANTED**. The claims against the Corizon Defendants are dismissed without prejudice as Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies against those defendants. The claims against the MDOC Defendants are dismissed with prejudice because the record contains no genuine disputes of material fact and the MDOC Defendants have established they are entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: September 27, 2019

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge